

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the careful consideration given to this application. Applicant now requests reconsideration of this application in view of the amendments above and the following remarks.

Claims 1-37 and 46-60 are now pending in the application. Claims 38-45 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 2, 10, 17, 21, 29, 46, and 51 have been amended. New Claims 56-60, depending, respectively, from Claims 1, 10, 17, 21, and 29, have been added.

At page 2, the Office Action rejects Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, based on an antecedent basis issue. Applicant respectfully submits that this has been addressed by the amendment to Claim 2 and requests withdrawal of this rejection.

At page 2, the Office Action objects to Claims 38-45 as being duplicates of Claims 21-28. Applicant has now cancelled Claims 38-45, rendering moot this objection.

At pages 16-18, the Office Action rejects Claims 21-26 and 38-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Walton et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0082356). At pages 3-14, the Office Action rejects Claims 1-11, 13-20, 27-30, 32-37, and 44-55 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walton et al. in view of Bjorklund et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,126,926). At page 15, the Office Action rejects Claims 12 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walton et al. and Bjorklund et al. in view of Smith et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0162519). The rejections of Claims 38-45 are now moot in view of their cancellation. The remaining rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claims 1, 10, 17, 21, and 29 have now been amended to recite that the processing of the signals is performed, not only using a mixing matrix, but also using a recovered signal obtained by another multi-antenna signal processing circuit. For example, Claim 1 now recites, “process said M independent RF modulated input signals using a channel mixing matrix and a signal from a second multi-antenna signal processing circuit to extract said video data transmitted by said radio

module transmitter and other radio module transmitters.” Claims 46 and 51 have been amended to recite that processing of the incoming signals to extract data signals is performed “using a channel mixing matrix and a recovered data signal.” These amendments are supported, for example, by Fig. 3A and the specification at page 18, lines 26 ff. It is respectfully submitted that the cited references fail to disclose or suggest such limitations.

In particular, Walton et al., noting, for example, paragraphs 459-492, discusses processing of a number of signals using an uplink channel matrix and related matrices; however, there is no disclosure of the use of a signal from a second multi-antenna signal processing circuit or of a recovered data signal, as now claimed. Similarly, Applicant has been unable to locate such limitations anywhere in either Bjorklund et al. or Smith et al.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1, 10, 17, 21, 29, 46, and 51, as well as their respective dependent claims, are allowable over the cited references.

New Claims 56-60 are supported, e.g., by the specification at page 18. These claims depend, respectively, from Claims 1, 10, 17, 21, and 29 and further specify that the signal received from the second multi-antenna signal processing circuit comprises a recovered data signal. It is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above.

Applicant may not have presented all possible arguments or have refuted the characterizations of either the claims or the prior art as found in the Office Action. However, the lack of such arguments or refutations is not intended to act as a waiver of such arguments or as concurrence with such characterizations.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that the above amendments and remarks address all of the grounds for objection and rejection and place the application in condition for allowance. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests prompt and favorable consideration of this response and reconsideration of this application.

While Applicant believes that no fees other than those that may be indicated in a separate paper are due, should any further fees be due, please charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 22-0185 under Order No. 27592-00275-US4.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: *October 10, 2007*

Jeffrey W. Gluck, Ph.D.
Registration No. 44,457
Connolly Bove Lodge & Hutz LLP
1875 Eye Street NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: 202-331-7111
Direct Dial: 202-572-0322
Facsimile: 202-293-6229